ASTA Workshop on the Changing Role of the Principal

Planning Services

Alberta
EDUCATION

85-1237/

ASTA WORKSHOP ON THE CHANGING ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

Under Contract to

Planning Services Branch
Alberta Education
Edmonton, Alberta

Evaluation Report Prepared by:

W.R. Unruh and F.T. Johnson
The University of Calgary

June, 1983

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	Executive Summary	i
	List of Tables	1
Section		
	Introduction and Overview	2
I.	Results of Questionnaire Analysis: Workshop I	4
II.	Conclusions Based on Evaluation of Workshop I	22
III.	Recommendations Arising Out of Evaluation of Workshop I	23
IV.	Results of Questionnaire Analysis: Workshop II	24
V.	Conclusions Based on Evaluation of Workshop II	40
VI.	Summary Conclusions and Recommendations	40
	Attachments	42

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 1983, the Alberta School Trustees Association, conducted a series of workshops in Edmonton, Calgary, Lethbridge and Grande Prairie on the role and function of the school principal. Two workshops were held in three of the centres, and one in Grande Prairie. Participants in the first workshop totalled 241 and included teachers (38), principals and vice-principals (84), superintendents (56) and trustees (63). The second workshop had a total of 171 participants with 18 teachers, 59 principals and vice-principals, 49 superintendents and 45 trustees in attendance. The A.S.T.A. contracted with Dr. W. R. Unruh and Dr. F. T. Johnson from the University of Calgary to conduct the evaluation of the workshops.

The purposes of these workshops were to assist school systems in defining the roles and functions of principals to develop school jurisdiction policies for implementing changes related to the principalship. Areas of responsibility for the principal which were studied and discussed at the workshops included: job descriptions, leadership, staff relationships, evaluation of teacher performance, discipline, community-school leadership, instruction and curriculum development, finance and business management and school plant operation among others. Information regarding the achievement of purposes and objectives was gathered by means of questionaires administered to the participants at the workshops.

Data concerning the effectiveness and success of the workshops were also obtained through on-site observations by the evaluators while attending the workshops.

Summary Conclusions and Recommendations

In the opinion of the evaluators, the workshops were well received and the objectives appear to have been generally achieved. Program planners had some difficulties in design because the participants were extremely heterogenous with respect to their needs and these needs were not always known to planners. As the workshops proceeded, however, presentors were able to adjust content adequately Good use was made of feedback provided by participants.

While the workshops, per se, were successful, the significant question to be addressed is whether or not participating jurisdictions moved closer to the goal of stating, adopting and implementing policy, and preparing role definition statements. Responses to this question indicate a substantial forward move. It was estimated that some 80% of participating jurisdictions have role definitions and Board policy statements.

According to participants, the notion of a job description, stated in terms of the principal's responsibilities, had not been addressed as extensively as it might have been. It was felt that this should become the focus for future activity in most jurisdictions. Participants also tended to indicate that they had expected somewhat greater emphasis on evaluation. On the other hand, the emphasis on stating the principal's role in terms of expected outcomes was well received and, for most, provided a new way of looking at the problem.

Optimism that role statements, principal's responsibilities and other functions will be implemented was very high among all stakeholder groups. Those who were most concerned were the teachers who, in general, were anxious that there would not be sufficient time and resources available for principals to do

all that which is expected of them.

The extent of actual implementation is not known, but there seems to be uniform opinion that such implementation is underway and that there is general agreement among stakeholder groups as to its nature and the process to be used. The process for implementation, however, is not complete. In fact, in planning the workshop, there was no objective stated which was intended to raise any expectations that this would be resolved at this point in time.

The results of the workshops lead to the conclusion that several more steps must be taken by government or some other agency if effective implementation is to be achieved. The following recommendations are offered for consideration:

1. There appears to be a need for an in-service program for principals. Job and role descriptions may be useful tools, but the job of principal is complex and cannot adequately be defined by pencil-and-paper documents. For example, the whole process of program and personnel evaluation is extremely complicated, requiring extensive training in the preparation and use of appropriate instrumentation. While large jurisdictions may be able to manage their own training programs, smaller jurisdictions will need support from some central agency.

2. Similar comments can be made with respect to the development of monitoring systems. Instrumentation and data collection and analysis plans need to be developed. Such plans should provide for self-evaluation, peer evaluation and process-product evaluation, especially in the formative sense. Again, the problem will be more severe for smaller jurisdictions.

3. Time and resources remain as major problems. The evaluation data provides no specific suggestions for dealing with this problem, so it is felt that such suggestions cannot be appropriately made. The need is obvious, but solutions will probably need to be found by individual jurisdictions, or the government may be able to supply special funding to conduct pilot projects, perhaps related to the in-service notion described above.

List of Tables

Table		Page
1.	Demographic Data: Distribution of Respondents by Geographic Area and Stakeholder Group Represented	4
2.	Reasons Given for Attending	5
3.	Role Statement and Implementation Status (Pre-Workshop)	7
4.	Problems in Role Definition (Pre-Workshop)	9
5.	Problems in Role Definition (Post-Workshop)	10
6.	Problems of Implementation (Pre-Workshop)	12
7.	Problems of Implementation (Post-Workshop)	13
8.	Pre- and Post-Workshop Levels of Optimism	14
9.	Ratings of Importance of Issues	15
10.	Workshop Ratings (Specifics)	17
11.	Overall Workshop Ratings	18
12.	Distribution of Respondents by Geographic Locations and Group Represented	24
13.	Respondent Perceptions of Current Status of School Board Policy Governing the Role of the Principal by Geographic Location and Stakeholder Group	26
14.	Respondent Perceptions of Current Status of Definitions of the Role of the Principal by Geographic Location and Stakeholder Group	27
15.	Respondent Perceptions of Current Status of Principal's Job Description by Geographic Location and Stakeholder Group	28
16.	Problems of Implementation (Workshop II)	30
17.	Ratings of Importance of Issues	32
18.	Workshop Ratings	33
19.	Ratings of Workshop Usefulness	35
20.	Overall Workshop Ratings	37

Introduction and Overview

In January of 1983, Dr. L. Ferguson contracted with Dr. W.R. Unruh and Dr. F.T. Johnson to conduct an evaluation of a series of workshops to be held in various Alberta centers. The purpose of these workshops was to help school jurisdictions to define and implement changes with respect to the role and function of the principal.

The following steps were taken to initiate the evaluation.

1. Questions to be addressed by the evaluation were stated by the evaluators and submitted to Dr. Ferguson.

2. A questionnaire was designed to elicit information from workshop participants before the first workshop began. In this report this questionnaire is referred to as the "White" (W) questionnaire (see Att. A). The information elicited by this questionnaire, in addition to certain demographic data, addressed a number of participant perceptions.

   - Reasons for attending the workshop. (W2)
   - Extent of implementation vis a vis policy statements re role of the principal. (W3)
   - Perceived level of importance re specific functions of principals. (W5)
   - Problems of definition of principal role as perceived prior to workshops. (W6)
   - Problems in implementation of policy regarding role of principal. (W7)
   - Participant optimism regarding likelihood of change in principal role. (W8)

3. A similar questionnaire - Blue (B) - was prepared for use at the end of the first workshop (see Att. B). This questionnaire contained items from the White questionnaire which were used to determine if changes in perception and status occured as a result of activities conducted during the workshop. (An additional set of items designed by the Workshop Planning Group was attached to this form. Analysis of these data was conducted independently and used as formative information for planning succeeding workshops.)

   The Blue form also contained items to elicit information about the following:

   - Indicators of participant perceptions regarding the status of implementation of change process in their jurisdictions. (B4)
   - Evaluation of specific issues of content and presentation of the workshops. (B5)

- Overall ratings of the workshops. (B6)
- Free-response sections allowing participants to indicate how the workshops could be improved (B7); whether the workshops resulted in benefits they had not anticipated (B8); what additional information participants now needed in order to proceed (B10); actions they felt their jurisdictions should take (B12); barriers they felt existed vis a vis implementation (B13); and a section in which they might state their major concerns (B14).

4. A third questionnaire - Gold (G) - was designed to assess the second series of workshops. It repeated some items from previous questionnaires as well as items designed to evaluate various aspects of the second series (see Att. C).

5. The evaluators attended the workshops in Edmonton, Calgary and Lethbridge. After a brief introduction, the White questionnaire was administered at the beginning of each of the workshops. The Blue questionnaire was administered at the end of the first series of workshops, referred to here as Workshop I. (Some minor revisions, described in the analysis below, were made to both forms after the Edmonton workshop. This was necessary because time had not been available for pilot testing.) The Gold questionnaire was administered at the end of the second workshop - Workshop II.

6. Specific items relating to the workshops were analyzed immediately after each session during Workshop I. Results were provided to the Planning Group for use as they deemed appropriate.

After all sessions of Workshop I had been completed, the responses were analyzed and are presented below under Section I, Results. This is followed by Section II, Conclusions and Section III, Recommendations. Results for Workshop II are presented separately but in a similar format.

A number of observations regarding the data and method of reporting should be made here.

1. We have reported results by geographic area. While such data may be pooled for general analysis, it is still probably useful to keep them separate because of the problem that became obvious during the Edmonton workshop - namely, that many of the jurisdictions were already farther along in their planning than the Program Group or the evaluators had anticipated. This discovery led to major changes in the program and thus to significantly different responses from the remaining two groups.

2. We have also reported results by stakeholder groups. While an analysis of W1 might have allowed for finer breakdowns of these groups, in the interests of maintaining reasonable sample sizes in each cell, we grouped principals and assistant principals together. The same procedure was used for superintendents.

3. In the original data analysis plan the evaluators had intended to perform correlations on specific items - that is from White to Blue. Problems arose, however, in the coding system used for the Edmonton group - i.e., participants did not follow instructions. We felt that this problem would lead to spurious results, and that, in any case, the data as presented are clear and need not be encumbered by statistical trappings of inadequate and dubious significance.

4. Participants tended to come and go. We were unable to collect both forms from all of them. Because we wanted to make sure that all post-evaluation questionnaires (B) were completed only by those who had been present for the whole workshop, we entered the analysis with responses only from those who had completed the pre-workshop questionnaires (W).

I. Results of Questionnaire Analysis: Workshop I

Item W1 was designed to elicit information from Workshop I participants regarding geographic location and stakeholder group represented. A summary of responses is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Demographic Data: Distribution of Respondents by Geographic Area and Stakeholder Group Represented

Group Represented	Edmonton	Calgary	Lethbridge	Total
Teachers	18	10	10	38
Principals	41	18	25	84
Superintendents	27	15	14	56
Trustees	34	12	17	63
TOTALS	120	55	66	241

Table 1 presents a summary of demographic information about participants who completed both the Pre- and Post-Workshop I questionnaires. Because some participants were not present at both the beginning and end of the workshop, we were unable to obtain complete information. We estimate that about 20 subjects in Edmonton, 9 in Calgary and 5 in Lethbridge did not complete both forms. These participants were excluded from the analysis.

The data presented in Table 1 do show, however, that there was substantial representation from each of the stakeholder groups with the teachers being perhaps underrepresented. In all cases, however, we felt that the numbers warranted presentation of evaluative data by these four groups.

Item W2 requested respondents to indicate their reasons for attending the workshop. A summary of responses to this item is presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Item W2: Reasons Given for Attending

	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Total			
Reason*	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
1.	10	21	2	1	7	9	3	1	7	7	2	2	24	37	7	4
2.	1	3	1	5	0	3	0	3	1	3	0	2	2	9	1	10
3.	2	6	18	12	3	3	8	4	1	3	7	12	6	12	33	28
4.	2	10	4	16	0	1	1	2	2	11	5	1	4	22	10	19
5.	2	1	2	1	0	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	4	5	2
TOTALS													38	84	56	63

* Reasons: 1. asked to attend
2. to learn progress to date of others
3. direct involvement in jurisdictional planning
4. general interest
5. others

The following observations with regard to the data in Table 2 are of some interest.

1. 24/38 or 68% of the teachers attended because they were asked to do so.

2. 37/84 or 44% of the principals gave the same reason.

3. 33/56 or 58% of the superintendents came because they felt they needed the information.

4. Many trustees also came for information but a large group also indicated a general interest in the problem.

While many differences can be seen among participants if we look at group make-up and geographic location, the main point to be made here is related to group heterogeneity. It is not surprising, as we note later, that a number of problems - and some benefits - arose out of this heterogeneity of expectations and preconceived needs and attitudes.

Item W3 was intended to elicit information about the extent to which jurisdictions had stated or implemented a policy regarding the role and function of the principal. Data from analysis of responses to this item are presented in Table 3.

What we attempted to do here was to prepare a series of eight graded statements one of which would describe the state of the art within a jurisdiction. A number of factors reduced the power of this item.

1. The evaluators (and program designers) were unaware that a number of jurisdictions had already been working on the problem. No item in our original questionnaire permitted them to indicate that they had a statement which needed only revision.

2. A number of participants appeared to be unaware of the status of the problem within their jurisdictions.

3. The frequencies presented in Table 3 are responses of invididuals and cannot be used to determine the level at which jurisdictions are currently operating.

4. Because the format of the item was changed after the Edmonton workshop, the results across geographic locations are not comparable.

Table 3

Item W3: Role Statement and Implementation Status (Pre-Workshop)

Level	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
1. No policy stated	2	2	2	5	0	3	0	1	1	5	2	3
2. Discussion only	1	0	3	8	3	3	1	2	0	0	0	0
3. Policy stated - not accepted	0	3	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	3
4. Policy stated and accepted	1	2	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	2	1	2
5.* Policy stated - requires revision	-	-	-	-	1	6	4	3	3	5	4	1
6. Policy stated and implemented	6	21	11	13	3	3	3	2	3	7	4	6
7. Policy evaluation plans in place	3	3	4	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0
8. Unwritten policy is followed	1	4	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	3	1	2
9.** Other	4	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0

* Item 5 was not used with the Edmonton group.

** Most responses in the Edmonton group in this category indicated they had a policy but it needed revision.

Despite these weaknesses, we do note that many participants indicated that they had policy statements which either simply needed revision or had, in fact, been implemented. The important point to note, once again, is that participants were at almost every possible point in terms of developing role and policy statements. This made for severe difficulties in determining an appropriate target population for the workshops.

Item W6 was designed to determine what problems in defining the role and function of the principal participants felt they had when they first came to the workshop. Item B2 was the same item, repeated at the end of the workshop to determine if these concerns had shifted as a result of discussion and workshop activities. Tables 4 and 5 present the results for these two items.

With regard to Tables 4 and 5, it should be noted that respondents were allowed to check more than one item. Thus the frequencies cannot be compared directly in terms of magnitude. They can, however, be viewed as percentages of the total as displayed in the last column. The most significant finding here is that at the beginning of the workshop only 11 percent chose Item 5: "The situation is clear to me and I have no special problem at the moment". At the end of the workshop 27 percent of the responses fell into this category. We also note a decrease from 17 percent to 11 percent in responses to Item 1: "Establishing in my own mind what the principal's role should be".

Analysis of the remaining items in this set indicated some reduction in concern regarding obtaining consensus, implementation and evaluation, but these still remained as problems for a number of participants.

Table 4

Item W6: Problems in Role Definition (Pre-Workshop)

	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Total				Problem	
Problem *	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	Total	%
1.	6	8	3	10	1	7	4	7	5	4	4	6	12	19	11	23	65	17
2.	6	19	9	14	4	8	3	4	4	12	6	9	14	39	18	27	98	26
3.	5	11	9	16	2	6	5	4	2	9	7	5	9	26	21	25	81	22
4.	3	7	13	15	5	5	3	4	3	10	4	4	11	22	20	23	76	20
5.	5	11	4	5	2	3	1	2	1	3	2	3	8	17	6	10	41	11
6.	0	3	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	4	3	3	11	3
													55	127	79	131	372	

* Problem; 1. Defining principal role
2. Obtaining consensus
3. Designing implementation plan
4. Designing evaluation plan
5. No problems
6. Other

Table 5

Item B2: Problems in Role Definition (Post-Workshop)

	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Total				Problem	
Problem *	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	Total	%
1.	2	5	5	5	0	3	0	4	3	7	2	2	5	15	7	11	38	11
2.	9	15	6	14	1	4	3	7	4	9	3	7	14	28	12	28	82	25
3.	2	8	4	10	1	7	4	5	0	4	5	3	3	19	13	18	53	16
4.	3	10	7	12	2	2	2	5	1	7	5	1	6	19	14	18	57	17
5.	9	13	12	13	6	6	4	2	6	8	4	7	21	27	20	22	90	27
6.	0	5	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	6	3	4	13	4
													49	114	69	101	333	

* Problem; 1. Defining principal role
2. Obtaining consensus
3. Designing implementation plan
4. Designing evaluation plan
5. No problems
6. Other

Item W7 was stated to permit participants to indicate what they felt to be the major problems in implementing change in the role of the principal at the time they came to the workshop. Item B3 was the same item repeated at the end of the workshop to determine if changes had occurred in participants' perceptions as a result of workshop activities. Results of response analysis to these items are presented in Tables 6 and 7.

With regard to Tables 6 and 7 it should again be noted that because respondents were permitted to select more than one response, the numbers are not directly comparable. An analysis of percentage shifts from pre- to post-workshop responses, does, however, reveal some important outcomes. Items 1, 2, and 3 became matters of less concern. Apparently, discussion during the workshop led to the perception that there was a more adequate definition of the role of the principal, that this role was agreed upon by various stakeholder groups, and that adequate discussion had taken place. Item 4 responses indicated slightly more concern (up from 5 percent to 10 percent) that implementation of the policy had not taken place. Item 5 (up from 19 percent to 34 percent) indicated that a number of participants moved from a position of having concerns to one in which they now felt comfortable about the way in which policy had been or was being implemented.

Items W8 and B9 asked participants to indicate on a four-point scale (four being high) how optimistic they felt about whether or not policy would be effectively implemented in their jurisdictions. Since the same item appeared on both questionnaires, it was possible to determine what effect the workshop had on these reported levels of

Table 6

Item W7: Problems of Implementation (Pre-Workshop)

Problem*	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Total				Problem	
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	Total	%
1.	3	6	3	7	1	3	1	1	2	8	0	4	6	17	4	12	39	17
2.	5	11	3	4	6	7	5	1	5	6	4	4	16	24	12	9	61	26
3.	7	6	9	16	1	5	6	6	1	3	5	1	9	14	20	23	66	28
4.	0	2	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	1	0	2	4	5	11	5
5.	0	13	5	3	2	2	2	1	2	6	2	7	4	21	9	11	45	19
6.	2	2	6	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	7	2	14	6
													37	81	56	62	236	

* Problem; 1. Role poorly defined
2. Role not agreed to
3. Inadequate discussion
4. Not implemented
5. No problems
6. Other

Table 7

Item B3: Problems of Implementation (Post-Workshop)

Problem *	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Total				Problem	
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	Total	%
1.	1	6	4	3	0	2	1	2	2	5	0	2	3	13	5	7	28	12
2.	6	6	6	1	3	3	1	3	1	3	4	3	10	12	11	7	40	17
3.	4	9	5	6	3	7	3	4	1	3	4	5	8	19	12	15	54	23
4.	4	5	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	5	3	0	7	10	4	4	25	10
5.	3	11	10	17	1	5	5	2	6	10	4	7	10	26	19	26	81	34
6.	0	3	1	3	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	4	3	5	12	5
													38	84	54	64	240	

* Problem; 1. Role poorly defined
2. Role not agreed to
3. Inadequate discussion
4. Not implemented
5. No problem
6. Other

optimism. The results of the response analysis for this item are presented in Table 8.

Table 8

Items W8 and B9: Pre - and Post-Workshop Levels of Optimism

	Edmonton		Calgary		Lethbridge	
	Pre W.S.	Post W.S.	Pre W.S.	Post W.S.	Pre W.S.	Post W.S.
Teachers	2.8 (.8)	2.8 (.9)	2.8(.8)	3.6 (.5)	3.2(.7)	3.1 (1.3)
Principals	2.7 (.7)	3.1 (1.0)	3.1(1.0)	3.4 (.7)	2.8(1.1)	3.4 (.7)
Supts.	2.9 (.9)	3.0 (.9)	3.4(.8)	3.7 (.5)	3.2(1.0)	3.5 (.5)
Trustees	2.6 (.8)	2.9 (.8)	2.9(.8)	3.5 (.7)	3.1(1.1)	3.7 (.6)

While specific conclusions could be drawn from data in Table 8 with respect to stakeholder groups or by geographic location, this probably is not warranted because a number of jurisdictions had already implemented policy and it was not always clear whether or not respondents then chose Item 5: "Not applicable in my jurisdiction".

Notwithstanding this problem, it is clear that a substantial increase in optimism took place as a result of workshop activities. Individual comments often indicated that this was because of the opportunity for communication among stakeholder groups.

Item B4 attempted to get at what participants perceived to be the status, within their jurisdictions, of specific issues related to change in the role and function of the principal. The results of responses to five issues, on a four-point scale, are presented in Table 9. (A rating of 4.0 would represent very strong agreement with the statement.) The following conclusions may be drawn from data presented in Table 9.

1. Most of the groups agreed that the description of the role and function of the principal was not clear to all parties in their jurisdiction.

2. Similarly, concern was expressed that the effectiveness of principals vis a vis this role and function was not being adequately assessed.

Table 9

Item B4: Ratings of Importance of Issues

Issue *	Calgary				Edmonton				Lethbridge			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
a	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.8
	(.9)	(.8)	(.7)	(.7)	(.7)	(.7)	(.5)	(.8)	(.9)	(.9)	(.6)	(.5)
b	2.6	2.8	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.5	2.6	3.1	2.6	2.6	2.7
	(1.0)	(1.1)	(.7)	(.7)	(.7)	(.7)	(.5)	(.8)	(.9)	(.7)	(.6)	(.5)
c	2.8	3.2	3.1	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.0	2.8	2.9
	(.9)	(.7)	(.6)	(.6)	(.9)	(.8)	(.6)	(.5)	(.9)	(.9)	(.8)	(.6)
d	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.3	2.8	3.1	2.5	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.9
	(.8)	(.9)	(.9)	(.8)	(.5)	(.6)	(.9)	(.7)	(.9)	(.7)	(.7)	(.5)
e	3.3	2.9	3.1	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.4	3.2	3.3	3.1
	(.7)	(.8)	(.6)	(.7)	(.5)	(.4)	(.6)	(.6)	(.5)	(.5)	(.5)	(.4)

* Issues; a. Role clear to all

b. Role effectiveness assessment good

c. Policy needs re-evaluation

d. Implementation procedures clear

e. Redefinition procedures clear

3. They generally agreed that there was currently a need to re-evaluate policy regarding the role and function of the principal.

4. There was substantial agreement that procedures were available for the implementation of policy. This latter was, at least partially, the result of the workshop as well as intra-jurisdictional activity that had already taken place.

5. There was strong agreement that procedures for defining policy were now available and clear to most participants.

Item B5 was designed to elicit responses in order to evaluate specific aspects of the workshop itself. Ten items, describing presentation and outcome variables, were provided. Participants were asked to rate each on a four-point scale from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". A category for "No Opinion" was also provided. The analysis of reponses to these items is presented in Table 10.

Given sample sizes and the heterogeneity of the group, a detailed analysis of the data presented in Table 10 does not seem appropriate. We note, however, that ratings provided by the Edmonton group were substantially lower than those for the other two groups. As indicated above, a problem arose for planners when it was discovered that many jurisdictions had already moved to introduce policy changes. Responses of the Calgary and Lethbridge groups indicate that the planners were able to adjust their presentations effectively in the remaining workshops.

This problem is also reflected in the responses to Item B5(e). Here again, respondents provided a somewhat low rating. The workshops were obviously aimed at a target population which presumably was working at a level somewhat beyond that expected by workshop planners.

Table 10

Item B5: Workshop Ratings (Specifics)

Item *	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
a	2.8	2.8	2.5	3.1	3.0	3.2	3.3	2.8	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.0
	(.7)	(.6)	(.7)	(.4)	(.5)	(.4)	(.4)	(.6)	(.4)	(.5)	(.6)	(.2)
b	2.8	2.6	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.8
	(.7)	(.8)	(.9)	(.6)	(.7)	(.5)	(.2)	(.6)	(.1)	(.6)	(.5)	(.4)
c	3.2	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.3	2.9	3.5	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.1
	(.6)	(.5)	(.5)	(.5)	(.3)	(.6)	(.4)	(.3)	(.8)	(.7)	(.6)	(.5)
d	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.4	3.1	2.9	2.9
	(.8)	(.7)	(.6)	(.6)	(.6)	(.5)	(.6)	(.4)	(.5)	(.6)	(.5)	(.7)
e	2.8	2.3	2.4	2.6	2.3	2.9	2.3	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.5	3.0
	(.8)	(.9)	(.9)	(.7)	(.9)	(.5)	(.7)	(.6)	(.6)	(.7)	(.8)	(.5)
f	2.6	2.7	2.5	3.0	2.7	3.1	3.0	3.1	3.2	2.7	2.9	2.9
	(.9)	(.8)	(.8)	(.5)	(.6)	(.4)	(.6)	(.3)	(.6)	(.6)	(.7)	(.4)
g	3.2	2.6	2.9	2.8	3.1	3.5	3.2	3.0	3.2	3.2	3.2	3.1
	(.5)	(.8)	(.7)	(.6)	(.4)	(.4)	(.4)	(.5)	(.4)	(.7)	(.6)	(.3)
h	2.6	2.8	2.9	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.0	3.2	3.1	3.1	2.8	3.2
	(.6)	(.7)	(.8)	(.7)	(.4)	(.6)	(.5)	(.4)	(.6)	(.7)	(.6)	(.4)
i	2.6	2.6	2.4	2.7	3.0	3.2	2.6	3.6	3.1	2.8	2.9	3.2
	(.7)	(.8)	(.9)	(.8)	(.5)	(.4)	(.6)	(.2)	(.6)	(.6)	(.7)	(.4)
Overall Mean:	2.6	2.7	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.0	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.0

* Items; a. Objectives clear
b. Topics as expected
c. Next steps clear
d. Useful problem solving methods
e. Resolved specific problems
f. Provided needed information
g. Adequate time to talk
h. Policy development process clear
i. Would recommend this workshop

Item B6 requested participants to provide an overall rating of Workshop I. A four-point scale, "Very Useful" to "Not Very Useful" was provided. The results are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Item B6: Overall Workshop Ratings

	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
X	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.6	3.1	3.2	2.7	3.3	3.1	2.6	2.9	2.9
s.d.	(.8)	(.9)	(.9)	(.8)	(.7)	(.8)	(.9)	(.6)	(.7)	(.8)	(.8)	(.7)

The results presented in Table 11 tend to support the findings described above - that is, the match between workshop objectives and participant expectations were more adequately met in the Calgary and Lethbridge workshops. We should note, however, that group size and facilities may also have been a significant factor vis a vis the Edmonton group responses. Problems of seeing projections and limits on space for discussion groups tended to cause some serious problems for presentors.

A further set of items, designed to measure the effectiveness of various aspects of the workshop, was prepared by the program planners and administered at the end of each workshop. Since the analysis of these materials was carried out by members of the planning group, we do not feel we should include them here as part of our analysis. We do

note, however, that the results provided by Mr. Annesley were very similar to those provided in our own analysis.

Free Response Items

Along with the forced choice questions already discussed, the evaluators sought perceptions and concerns of workshop participants through a series of open-ended questions. Not all participants responded to these questions and the answers, where given, were often unique. However, certain areas of common interest did appear as determined by an item having been mentioned by three or more members of one or more of the subgroups (teachers, trustees, principals, superintendents) at a workshop site, or where an item was mentioned at least once by someone at each of the workshop locations. These results are reported in the following discussion.

Only one item requesting anecdotal information was included in the pre-workshop questionnaire, W9, and it appeared, as well, on the post-workshop questionnaire as B14. It sought to elicit participant concerns regarding defining and implementing policy on the role of the principal. By including it on both questionnaires it was hoped changes, accruing as of function of the workshop, might appear. For the Edmonton participants common concerns on W9 were "providing sufficient flexibility for principals," "obtaining consensus amont all stakeholder groups," "how to evaluate policy once implemented?" and "overloading the principal." As well, the principals, in particular, were concerned about whether or not the policy would specify clear expectations for them. On B14 concerns were fewer but the matters of "consensus" and "evaluation" were still mentioned several times by each of the workshop

subgroups. As well, the matter of "overloading the principal" was also mentioned by several principals and superintendents. In Calgary, on W9, the only common concern to all workshop subgroups was "obtaining principal commitment". Further, several members of the teacher, principal and trustee subgroups were concerned about "obtaining consensus" and "adequate funding". Only "obtaining consensus" was mentioned more than once on B14 by the Calgary participants. Lethbridge participants expressed across the subgroups, on W9, common concerns regarding "adequate financing", "commitment from principals" and "consensus among all stakeholder groups". Only one common concern appeared on the Lethbridge responses to B14. That was "obtaining consensus amont all stakeholder groups."

Item B8 asked participants if the workshop resulted in any unanticipated benefits for them. Response to this question was not heavy, making a breakdown by workshop site rather meaningless. However, these statements were made by at least one participant at each of the sites: "insight into the policy making process," "demonstrated the need to review existing policy," "an appreciation of the complexity of the role of the principal" and "valuable interaction among people in different roles related to education".

Responses to B10 which asked "What additional information/help do you need at this time in order to proceed with planning and implementation?" were even fewer than to item B8. One request, common to all workshop sites, did emerge though. That was "examples are needed of role and policy statements from jurisdictions that already have them in place and operating."

Item B12 asked participants: "With respect to definition, implementation and assessment of the role and function of the principal, what actions do you think need to be taken now?" In Edmonton several members from each of the participant subgroups responded with: "further internal discussion leading to revision and consensus," "make provision for evaluation," and "proceed as we have planned." Several trustees expressed the need to "communicate policy to all stakeholder groups," but stood alone among the workshop subgroups in doing so. At least one participant from each of the subgroups participating in the Calgary workshop indicated the need to "revise current board policy regarding the role of the principal", and several principals felt "a review of board policy-making procedures" would be in order. In Lethbridge participants from all subgroups were in agreement on the need to "review and revise existing policies and regulations on the role of the principal." Though a number of other comments were made by this group, no common threads were apparent among them.

"What problems do you see in defining, implementing and assessing the effectiveness of policy on the role of the principal?" represented item B13. In Edmonton substantive concerns regarding these issues emerged as "obtaining consensus among all stakeholder groups," "obtaining adequate funding," "having sufficient time to do the job properly" and "how to get or how to develop effective assessment tools." In Calgary the matter of effective evaluation was also seen as a major problem with "time to do the job" and "how to generate commitment among principals with long tenure" also of some concern. Lethbridge partici-

pants saw "getting consensus" and "designing appropriate assessment instruments" as major barriers with "probable lack of adequate time" of some concern.

II. Conclusions Based on Evaluation of Workshop I

1. Inspection of Table 1 indicates that stakeholder groups were well represented at each of the first workshop series. Verbal comments from respondents indicated that the teacher group was somewhat under-represented, but to our knowledge this did not have any impact on workshop effectiveness.

2. Table 2 provides evidence that the group at the first series of workshops was heterogeneous with respect to reasons - and therefore expectations - for attending the workshop. While this led to problems for workshop organizers, it also proved to be beneficial in terms of communication. We view this as an unanticipated positive side effect.

3. Many jurisdictions had completed preliminary work in terms of policy and role statements vis a vis the role of the principal. This created another basis for group heterogeneity and a source of difficulty for workshop organizers. A revision of workshop content following the Edmonton presentation was necessary. Workshop I effectiveness indicators were substantially higher for sessions in Calgary and Lethbridge, indicating that planners were effectively adjusting to the problem.

4. An examination of Tables 4 and 5 suggests that Workshop I was effective in shifting concerns with respect to defining the role and function of the principal. At the beginning of the workshop 43% of respondents reported concerns about establishing what the role of the principal should be and how consensus regarding the role might be established. This concern was reported by only 36% of respondents by the end of the workshop. Furthermore, by the end of the workshop, 27% of respondents felt they now had no problems (only 11% so indicated at the beginning of the workshop).

5. Tables 6 and 7 indicate a substantial shift in concerns regarding implementation of a change in the principal's role. At the outset 71% of respondents indicated concerns related to inadequate role definition, lack of agreement among stakeholder groups and inadequate discussion among stakeholder groups. These concerns were only voiced by 52% of the group by the end of the workshop. By the end of the workshop 34% indicated they had no difficulties with respect to implementation - up from 19% at the beginning.

6. Table 8 indicates that there was a substantial increase in terms of how optimistic respondents were that change would actually take place. This was particularly true of the Calgary and Lethbridge groups.

7. Table 9 provides data about the perceived status of specific issues in jurisdictions. We note that these items to not relate directly to workshop effectiveness but are rather an indication of intra-jurisdictional concerns. These concerns are summarized on Page 13.

8. Table 9 summarizes Workshop I ratings. No numerical benchmarks are available--that is, we do not have a criterion which establishes an acceptable response level. Experience from other evaluations of this kind suggests that a rating of 3.0 is acceptable. By this criterion the Lethbridge and Calgary workshops may be described as successful. The exception to this conclusion is item B5(e). Respondents tended to give lower responses to this item--i.e., the workshop was not seen as being very successful in terms of helping them to solve specific problems they had when they came. Once again, it is our view that this rating was affected by group heterogeneity. It would have been very difficult for program planners to respond to the range of needs of the group without a substantial change in format.

9. The overall Workshop I ratings presented in Table 11 substantiate the conclusions noted above. Response differences among stake-holder groups are small and insignificant. In our opinion, the last two workshops were successful. We also believe that the ratings given by the Edmonton group may have been substantially affected by factors such as group size, inadequate facilities, etc. Other indicators show that a number of the objectives of the Edmonton workshop were still achieved.

10. An analysis of open-ended responses has been supplied above. It is our feeling that responses to these items are of use for the purposes of future planning. We note, however, that they tended to be idiosyncratic and can, therefore, not be adequately aggregated. What factors are viewed by some jurisdictions as problems may not be so perceived by others depending on the status of the change process within a jurisdiction.

III. Recommendations Arising Out of Evaluation of Workshop I

In our view a further set of workshops (labelled here as Workshop II) is warranted on the basis of data provided above. If these are undertaken, we feel that the following guidlines may be helpful.

1. The Workshop II plan should take into account the needs of individual jurisdictions. In our view it is doubtful that one basic presentation will appeal to all groups.

2. Such a workshop should pay special attention to topics such as procedures for implementation and evaluation.(See also Conclusions 4, 5, and 10.)

3. Notices advertising the follow-up workshop should clearly indicate the content and purposes to be addressed. This is particularly important for the Edmonton group who were more negative.

4. Some sample role and policy statements, which are perceived by experts to be "good" models, should be supplied to participants. It would also be helpful if a format were devised which would allow participants to evaluate their own products against these models.

5. The ASTA should develop a Check List containing a list of elements which an adequate policy statement would contain. Such a Check List would permit a jurisdiciton to determine where they were vis a vis other jurisdictions and vis a vis some reasonable standard. Such an instrument could also be expanded to include items regarding implementation and evaluation procedures.

IV. Results of Questionnaire Analysis: Workshop II

Table 12 provides a description of participants who attended the second workshop. (See Table 1 for comparison to first workshop.)

Table 12

Item G1: Distribution of Respondents by Geographic Location and Group Represented

Group Represented	Edmonton	Calgary	Lethbridge	Grand Prairie[3]	Total
Teachers	6	3	8	1	18
Principals[1]	26	9	13	11	59
Superintendents[2]	22	11	10	6	49
Trustees	26	5	9	5	45
TOTALS	80	28	40	23	171

1. Includes Assistant Principals, Vice Principals, etc.
2. Includes Assistant Superintendents, etc.
3. Data from Grand Prairie were not available for Workshop I.

Inspection of Table 12 indicates that there was substantial representation from each stakeholder group. The exception to this was the teacher group, which dropped from being 15% at the first workshop to only 10% at the second one. We also note that the attendance was generally lower for the second workshop. A number of reasons accounted

for this drop in attendance. The somewhat negative reaction of the Edmonton group was a factor, but more significant was the time of year and the fact that a number of jurisdictions felt that they were far enough along in the process not to need further help.

Items G2, G3 and G4 were designed to elicit information as to progress vis a vis jurisdictional development of Board Policy, Role Statements and Job Descriptions as these related to the role of the principal. An analysis of responses to these items is provided in Tables 13, 14 and 15.

An examination of Table 13 indicates that of 171 respondents 95, or 54%, felt that Board Policy regarding the role of the principal has been stated and is now either in place or in the final stages of being discussed by stakeholder groups. Some 54 respondents indicated that formulation of policy statements was underway, and 13 were still having some difficulty in coming to grips with the problem. Other comments and data sources indicated that respondents who chose Option 3 might actually have also chosen Option 2. Our estimate is that of the jurisdictions who attended the workshops, approximately 80% now have policy statements and that these statements are under active review. Those who do not have such statements tend to be small jurisdictions with limited resources available for both planning and implementation.

Item G3 inquired as to the status of role definitions for principals. The pattern of responses (See Table 14) was similar to that in G2. In many cases it appears that job descriptions were written first. This would be a natural expectation because the literature on this topic is abundant and the problem itself is more easily defined.

Table 13

Item G2: Respondent Perceptions of Current Status of School Board Policy Governing the Role of the Principal by Geographic Location and Stakeholder Group

Level	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Grand Prairie			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
1. Policy in place--no problems	2	12	10	9	1	1	2	2	4	8	4	3	0	1	3	1
2. Policy written--no agreement	1	0	3	1	2	2	4	2	3	3	5	3	0	1	2	0
3. Policy formulation underway	3	9	6	8	0	5	5	2	1	0	1	2	1	6	3	2
4. Not sure personally	0	3	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
5. Other	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	2

Table 14

Item G3: Respondent Perceptions of Current Status of Definitions of the Role of the Principal by Geographic Location and Stakeholder Group

Level	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Grand Prairie			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
1. Statements written--no problems	2	12	8	9	0	0	2	0	3	3	6	3	0	4	1	1
2. Statements written--no agreement	1	1	5	1	3	5	3	2	4	6	5	5	0	1	2	0
3. Statements being prepared	3	6	4	7	0	2	4	2	1	1	0	1	1	5	3	2
4. Not sure personally	0	4	3	8	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
5. Other	0	2	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1

Table 15

Item G4: Respondent Perceptions of Current Status of Principal's Job Description by Geographic Location and Stakeholder Group

Level	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Grand Prairie			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
1. Description adopted	2	11	8	8	0	0	3	0	3	1	6	2	1	1	1	0
2. Description written--no agreement	1	0	4	2	3	3	2	2	4	5	5	4	0	0	2	1
3. Formulation underway	2	7	5	6	0	1	4	3	1	2	0	1	0	5	1	1
4. Not sure personally	0	4	3	9	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	4	2	1
5. Other	0	3	2	1	0	3	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	2

Item G4, reported in Table 15, tried to establish the extent of activity related to providing the principal's job description. While the pattern of responses was similar, there was, nevertheless, substantially less progress in this area. This, again, was not unexpected because the first workshop had not dealt with this topic.

Because the aims of Workshop II differed substantially from those of Workshop I, the items on the questionnaire were also altered. As a result, direct comparisons to Workshop I responses are difficult to make. An examination of responses presented in Table 3, however, indicates that most jurisdictions who participated in the workshops made substantial progress since the project was first launched. As suggested above, about 80% of those who participated now have stated policy; a similar number have role definitions; and about 60% have at least preliminary drafts of job descriptions.

Item G5 asked respondents to indicate what they felt were the major problems which they would face when implementing change in the role of the principal. The summary of responses is presented in Table 16.

The results presented in Table 16 can be compared directly with those presented in Tables 6 and 7. The latter represents the concerns of participants before and after the first workshop. One important factor must be kept in mind in interpreting the results and that is that a substantial number of people did not attend Workshop II. An analysis of participants indicates that most of the jurisdictions that did not attend the second workshop were those who had implemented policy either prior to Workshop I or during the interval between Workshops I and II. The results presented in the three tables are therefore not directly comparable; in fact, we note that in many ways the participants in

Table 16

Item G5: Problems of Implementation (Workshop II)

Problem *	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Grand Prairie				Total				Problem	
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	Total	%
1.	0	8	4	2	0	2	3	0	1	2	0	2	0	5	2	0	1	17	9	4	31	18
2.	3	5	8	7	1	3	4	1	2	0	2	3	1	2	1	3	7	10	15	14	46	26
3.	0	1	2	4	1	0	2	0	2	4	2	1	0	1	1	0	3	6	7	5	21	12
4.	1	1	2	4	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	5	12	6
5.	0	10	4	8	1	2	0	0	3	3	9	2	0	3	2	2	4	18	15	12	49	29
6.	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	5	10	5
																	17	56	51	45	169	

* Problems; 1. Role not well defined
2. Inadequate discussion
3. Defined but not implemented
4. Not implemented - no resources
5. No problems
6. Other

Workshop II responded similarly to the previous group at the beginning of Workshop I. A noteable exception to this observation is that only 12% chose Option 3, "The role has been defined and agreed to but has not been implemented", at the end of Workshop II. Nevertheless, role definition appears to be complete or in the final stages of discussion for about 70% of this group.

Item G6 attempted to elicit opinions on a number of issues related to the role and function of the principal. It should be noted that these issues were not directly addressed in Workshop II but were used only to obtain additional information which might help to describe the situation in Alberta schools. The analysis of responses is presented in Table 17.

According to Table 17, most respondents are not greatly concerned about issues related to implementing a new role for the principal. We note, however, that items d and g were given lower ratings than were other issues. Other data presented in this report also support the finding that there are concerns about monitoring or evaluation and concerns about availability of time and resources. Additionally, we may also note that all groups feel very much the same way about most issues, although superintendents are slightly more positive than principals and both groups are slightly more positive than trustees.

Item G7 was specifically designed to evaluate elements of Workshop II and the quality of presentation. Respondents were asked to respond to nine evaluative items on a scale which ranged from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree". A "No Opinion" column was also supplied. Means and standard deviations of participant responses are reported in Table 18. The highest possible mean on each item would have been 4.0.

Table 17

Item G6: Ratings of Importance of Issues

Item	Edmonton T	Edmonton P	Edmonton S	Edmonton Tr	Calgary T	Calgary P	Calgary S	Calgary Tr	Lethbridge T	Lethbridge P	Lethbridge S	Lethbridge Tr	Grand Prairie T*	Grand Prairie P	Grand Prairie S	Grand Prairie Tr
Description clear to all	2.2	2.7	2.8	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.6	2.4	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.1	-	2.5	2.0	2.6
	(.9)	(.9)	(.6)	(.8)	(.6)	(.5)	(.7)	(.6)	(.9)	(.7)	(.4)	(.8)	-	(.8)	(.4)	(.6)
Principal effectiveness adequately assessed	2.0	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.6	3.3	2.5	3.1	-	2.8	2.4	2.6
	(.9)	(.8)	(.7)	(.8)	(.7)	(.4)	(.6)	(.6)	(.7)	(.6)	(.7)	(.5)	-	(.8)	(.6)	(.6)
Procedures to implement are clear	2.0	2.7	3.2	2.7	2.7	3.0	2.9	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.0	3.1	-	3.0	3.1	2.8
	(.8)	(.8)	(.8)	(.7)	(.6)	(.7)	(.7)	(.9)	(.7)	(.5)	(.2)	(.8)	-	(.2)	(.4)	(.2)
Purposes for monitoring clearly defined	1.7	2.6	2.6	2.5	3.0	2.4	2.5	2.2	3.0	3.0	2.9	2.8	-	2.4	2.7	2.4
	(.6)	(.7)	(.9)	(.8)	(.0)	(.7)	(.5)	(.5)	(.5)	(.4)	(.6)	(.7)	-	(.8)	(.8)	(.4)
Adequate resources are assured	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.2	1.8	2.9	2.8	2.5	3.1	-	2.6	2.8	2.6
	(.6)	(.8)	(.6)	(.9)	(.7)	(.9)	(.8)	(.5)	(.2)	(.9)	(.7)	(.4)	-	(.9)	(.5)	(.4)
Quality of plans make success possible	2.3	2.6	2.7	3.0	3.0	2.7	2.7	2.0	3.0	3.1	2.7	3.0	-	2.5	2.6	2.6
	(.6)	(.7)	(.7)	(.3)	(.0)	(.9)	(.9)	(.7)	(.4)	(.7)	(.5)	(.2)	-	(.9)	(.6)	(.4)
Principals will have adequate resources	2.0	2.3	2.8	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.9	2.0	2.6	2.8	2.9	3.0	-	2.4	2.2	2.6
	(.4)	(.6)	(.7)	(.7)	(.9)	(.9)	(.4)	(.4)	(.9)	(.9)	(.4)	(.3)	-	(.9)	(.2)	(.9)
Principals have adequate authority	2.5	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.7	3.1	3.3	3.0	3.0	-	3.0	2.8	2.8
	(.6)	(.7)	(.8)	(.6)	(.4)	(.9)	(.4)	(.5)	(.6)	(.8)	(.2)	(.2)	-	(.3)	(.2)	(.4)

* Not calculated because of small sample size

Table 18

Item G7: Workshop Ratings (Specific)

Item	Edmonton T	Edmonton P	Edmonton S	Edmonton Tr	Calgary T	Calgary P	Calgary S	Calgary Tr	Lethbridge T	Lethbridge P	Lethbridge S	Lethbridge Tr	Grand Prairie T*	Grand Prairie P	Grand Prairie S	Grand Prairie Tr
Workshop objectives clear	3.0 (.0)	3.2 (.6)	3.2 (.5)	3.0 (.2)	3.0 (.0)	3.1 (.3)	3.3 (.5)	3.0 (.0)	2.7 (.9)	2.9 (.8)	2.7 (.5)	3.0 (.2)	- -	3.3 (.5)	3.3 (.5)	3.2 (.5)
Expected topics addressed	3.4 (.4)	3.1 (.6)	3.2 (.8)	2.7 (.7)	3.0 (.0)	2.8 (.4)	3.3 (.7)	2.7 (.6)	2.6 (.7)	3.3 (.6)	2.4 (.5)	3.0 (.2)	- -	3.3 (.5)	3.0 (.3)	3.2 (.5)
Next steps to take specified	3.3 (.5)	3.3 (.5)	3.1 (.6)	3.1 (.5)	3.0 (.0)	3.0 (.2)	3.5 (.7)	3.0 (.0)	3.3 (.7)	3.3 (.5)	3.0 (.3)	3.0 (.3)	- -	3.1 (.4)	3.0 (.5)	3.6 (.6)
Helped solve specific problems	2.8 (.4)	3.2 (.6)	3.0 (.7)	2.9 (.7)	3.0 (.0)	3.0 (.4)	3.0 (.4)	3.0 (.0)	3.0 (.5)	2.9 (.7)	2.8 (.6)	2.8 (.8)	- -	3.0 (.9)	2.5 (.9)	3.4 (.6)
Information needed to proceed given	3.2 (.5)	3.2 (.5)	3.2 (.6)	3.1 (.5)	3.0 (.0)	3.0 (.3)	3.2 (.5)	2.7 (.6)	3.0 (.3)	2.8 (.9)	2.5 (.7)	2.6 (.5)	- -	3.1 (.4)	3.0 (.7)	3.0 (.7)
Adequate time for interaction	3.0 (.9)	3.0 (.8)	2.8 (.6)	2.9 (.7)	2.0 (.9)	2.3 (.7)	2.5 (.9)	3.0 (.0)	3.0 (.3)	3.0 (.8)	2.9 (.5)	3.0 (.3)	- -	2.3 (.9)	2.4 (.6)	2.6 (.6)
Distinguished between basic terminology	3.6 (.6)	3.4 (.7)	3.2 (.6)	3.0 (.2)	3.7 (.6)	3.4 (.5)	3.5 (.5)	3.0 (.9)	3.0 (.3)	2.8 (.9)	2.8 (.5)	3.0 (.0)	- -	3.4 (.9)	3.5 (.6)	3.4 (.9)
Evaluation adequately discussed	2.8 (.8)	2.6 (.8)	2.7 (.9)	2.8 (.6)	3.3 (.7)	2.1 (.6)	2.7 (.7)	2.0 (.0)	2.6 (.9)	2.8 (.7)	2.8 (.5)	2.5 (.6)	- -	3.0 (.9)	3.0 (.5)	3.0 (.0)
Resistance to change addressed	3.3 (.8)	3.2 (.7)	3.2 (.5)	3.0 (.1)	3.7 (.6)	3.0 (.2)	3.0 (.2)	2.7 (.6)	3.1 (.6)	3.0 (.3)	3.0 (.2)	3.0 (.0)	- -	3.4 (.6)	3.0 (.0)	3.0 (.7)

* Insufficient sample for analysis

Examination of Table 18 indicates that ratings for Workshop II were consistently high. The lowest ratings were assigned to Item G7(h), "Planning a monitoring (evaluation) system was adequately discussed". It should be noted that while the workshop included some concepts related to evaluation, this was not a major emphasis. What these ratings and other comments do imply, however, is that participants felt the need for more information about evaluation. More will be said of this later.

The results presented in Table 18 may also be compared to those presented in Table 10. In general, this comparison indicates a more favourable response to Workshop II. This was partially due to the fact that Workshop II more closely met the needs of the group. It should be noted, however, that a number of people had already completed the activities which Workshop I addressed and therefore felt it was not as useful. In any case, Workshop II appears to have been successful in meeting the expectations of participants.

Item G9 was designed to determine how optimistic participants were that change would actually take place. The analysis of responses, which ranged from "very optimistic" to "not very optimistic", is presented in Table 19. The maximum rating which could have been made was 4.0.

Inspection of Table 19 indicates a very high level of optimism among all groups. These figures may be compared to those presented in Table 8 which displays the mean ratings given to this item prior to, and after, Workshop I. The ratings at the end of Workshop II are very similar to those made at the end of Workshop I. Most groups are apparently highly optimistic that the role of the principal, as they have defined it, can and will be implemented.

Table 19

Item G3: Ratings of Workshop Usefulness

	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Grand Prairie			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T*	P	S	Tr
Mean	3.8	4.2	4.3	4.0	3.7	4.3	4.4	4.0	3.6	4.1	4.1	4.1	*	4.2	4.2	4.6
s.d.	(.4)	(.6)	(.7)	(.9)	(.6)	(.7)	(.7)	(.7)	(.4)	(.6)	(.7)	(.6)	*	(.8)	(.8)	(.6)

* Insufficient sample for analysis

Item G13 asked participants to indicate to what extent Workshop II had been useful in helping their jurisdiction to move toward developing policy and role statements with respect to the role of the principal. Analysis of responses to this item appears in Table 19. The maximum rating on this item would have been 5.0.

Table 19 indicates that all groups found the workshop to have been very useful. The lowest ratings were usually given by the teacher groups. There was no indication in comments as to why this should have been the case. In all cases, the number of teachers who participated was quite small, so the results need to be interpreted with care. From comments made by teachers, we did conclude that they were very concerned that the principals would have the time or resources to do what was now being demanded of them. Thus, they tended to feel that help of a kind which could not be given by a workshop was needed. In fact, several of them felt strongly the specific in-service courses for principals should be conducted.

Item G14 asked participants to provide overall ratings of Workshop II on a four-point scale, 4 being high. Analysis of responses to this item are presented in Table 20.

Table 20 indicates that all group participants assigned a high ratings to Workshop II. Comments were also highly favorable. These ratings may be compared to those made for Workshop I by looking at Table 11. A number of reasons for the higher ratings assigned to Workshop II may be suggested. The needs of participants in Workshop II had been more clearly established so that planners could take them into account; sizes of the groups were smaller and therefore more manageable; and a

Table 20

Item G14: Overall Workshop Ratings

	Edmonton				Calgary				Lethbridge				Grand Prairie			
	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr	T	P	S	Tr
Mean	3.2	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.0	3.6	3.7	3.4	3.0	3.4	3.6	3.4	*	3.7	3.5	4.0
s.d.	(.4)	(.6)	(.7)	(.7)	(.0)	(.5)	(.7)	(.6)	(.4)	(.6)	(.7)	(.6)	*	(.5)	(.6)	(.0)

* Not analyzed because of insufficient sample

number of participants who were disillusioned that Workshop I did not meet their expectations did not attend Workshop II.

Free Response Items

As in the evaluation of Workshop 1, participants were encouraged to describe personal perceptions or concerns on several dimensions through a series of open-ended questions. For Workshop II these were items G8, C9 and G11 (a & b) on the questionnaire. Again, participants did not always respond to these questions and often, where they did, the comments were unique. However, where areas of common interest did appear, either within one or more of the subgroups at a site or across sites, they are noted in the following discussion. Further, as questions G8, G9 and G11a are the same as B8, B12 and B13 from Workshop I respectively, continuing concerns are also reported.

Item G8 asked participants if the workshop provided them with any unanticipated benefits. In Edmonton, at least one member of each of the subgroups (several superintendents) noted "the emphasis on results" as one such benefit and at least one person from each of the other sites did as well. A further benefit, mentioned at least once from each of the workshop locations, was "clarification of the planning and implementation process". There was no apparent commonality in unanticipated benefits occurring across Workshops I and II.

Item G10 asked participants, "With respect to definition, implementation and assessment of the role and function of the principal in your jurisdiction, what actions do you think need to be taken now? What changes in procedures, etc., would you like to see in your jurisdiction?" Responses to this question were quite heavy. In Edmonton at least one member of each of the subgroups expressed the need

for "agreement among stakeholder groups" and several of the superintendents and principals in attendance stressed the need for "further clarification" and "establishment of evaluation policies". The matters of "agreement across stakeholder groups" and "development of evaluation strategies" were noted by several of the superintendents and principals in Lethbridge. The need to "revise and refine existing policy" was offered at least once by a participant from each of the workshop sites. Comparing these results with those from B12 of Workshop I indicates some matters needing action remain as unresolved issues after Workshop II. Specifically, these matters are "establishing processes for evaluation and monitoring" and "obtaining concensus among stakeholder groups".

"What problems do you see in implementing policy statements, role statements and job descriptions?" formed item G11(a). Several participants from each of the superintendent, trustee and principal subgroups in Edmonton saw "lack of time" as a major problem. As well, several of the superintendents and principals, again from that workshop, saw "resistance to change" as a substantive roadblock. "Lack of time", "cost", and "resistance to change" were mentioned at least once by a participant at each of the workshop sites. Comparing these results with those from the comparable question in Workshop I indicates "lack of time" and "adequate funding" continue to be unresolved substantial problems.

The final open-ended item from Workshop II, G11b, asked "What problems do you see in assessing the effectiveness of implementation?" For this item, three distinct problem areas appeared, each of which was common to participants at all of the workshop sites. These concerns

were defined as "lack of time", "obtaining acceptance for monitoring" and "establishing criteria for monitoring". As this item was not used for Workshop I, no cross-comparisons were possible.

V. Conclusions Based on Evaluation of Workshop II

1. Table 1 indicates that, with the exception of the teacher group, all stakeholder groups were well represented. The number of participants in Workshop II was smaller than in Workshop I, and other data indicate that the group was also somewhat more homogenous with respect to needs and expectations.

2. Substantial progress has been made with respect to statements of Board Policy. About 80% of jurisdictions who participated have such statements. A similar number have also prepared role definition statements. The notion of a job description, stated in terms of the principal's responsibilities, had not been addressed as extensively as the other two problems. In fact, this was the major focus of Workshop II, and, according to participant responses, was to become a focus for future activity in most jurisdictions.

3. Major barriers to implementation appear to focus on time and resources, in-service education for principals, and the need to establish monitoring systems to evaluate the effects of implementation both formatively and summatively.

4. Workshop II was uniformly well received. There were still problems in determining the target population. Workshop planners appear to have been able to take group heterogeneity into account. Participants did tend to indicate, however, that they expected a somewhat greater emphasis on evaluation. On the other hand, the emphasis on stating the principal's role in terms of expected outcomes was well received and for most provided a new way of looking at the problem.

5. Optimism that role statements, etc., will be implemented is very high among all stakeholder groups. Those who are most concerned are the teachers who, in general, are anxious that there will not be sufficient time and resources available for principals to do what is expected of them.

6. Overall workshop ratings were favorable in all cases. Expectations of groups seem to have been met. As noted above, however, jurisdictions are still concerned about the logistics of implementation and the establishment of monitoring systems. These concerns were also found in the analysis of responses to open-ended items.

VI. Summary Conclusions and Recommendations

In the opinion of the evaluators, workshop objectives appear to have been generally achieved. Program planners had some difficulties in

design because the participants were extremely heterogenous with respect to their needs and these needs were not always known to planners. As the workshops proceeded, however, presentors were able to adjust content adequately. Good use was made of feedback provided by participants.

While the workshops, per se, were successful, the significant question to be addressed is whether or not participating jurisdictions moved closer to the goal of stating, adopting and implementing policy, role and job description statements. Again, responses to this question indicate a substantial forward move. We estimate that some 80% of participating jurisdictions now have role descriptions and Board Policy. The extent of actual implementation is not known, but there seems to uniform opinion that such implementation is underway and that there is general agreement among stakeholder groups as to its nature and the process to be used.

The process, however, is not complete. In fact, there was no objective in workshop planning which suggested the expectation that it would be at this point in time. It is our opinion, nevertheless, that several more steps must be taken by government or some other agency if effective implementation is to be achieved.

1. There appears to be a need for an in-service program for principals. Job and role descriptions may be useful tools, but the job of principal is complex and cannot adequately be defined by pencil-and-paper documents. For example, the whole process of program and personnel evaluation is extremely complicated, requiring extensive training in the preparation and use of appropriate instrumentation. While large jurisdictions may be able to manage their own training programs, smaller jurisdictions will need support from some central agency.

2. Similar comments can be made with respect to the development of monitoring systems. Instrumentation and data collection and analysis plans need to be developed. Such plans should provide for self-evaluation, peer evaluation and process-product evaluation, especially in the formative sense. Again, the problem will be more severe for smaller jurisdictions.

3. Time and resources remain as major problems. The evaluation data provides no specific suggestions for dealing with this problem, and we do not feel that such suggestions can be appropriately made by us. The need is obvious, but solutions will probably need to be found by individual jurisdictions, or the government may be able to supply special funding to conduct pilot projects, perhaps related to the in-service notion described above.

ATTACHMENT A

Workshop I: Pre-Questionnaire

1. Code: _____

ASTA Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire

The Role of the Principal

1. Which one of the following best describes your role at this workshop?

___ Teacher
___ Asst./Vice Principal
___ School Superintendent
___ Assistant Superintendent
___ School trustee
___ Principal
___ Other (Please specify) _____

2. My major reason for attending this Workshop was that: (Check one item only.)

___ 1. I was asked to do so.
___ 2. I wanted more information regarding what others were doing.
___ 3. I needed the information because I am directly involved in the process of defining the role of the principal.
___ 4. I came because I am generally interested in the problem.
___ 5. Other _____

3. To what extent has your jurisdiction stated or implemented a policy regarding the role of the school principal? (Check the item that best describes current status.)

___ 1. No policy has been formally stated as yet.
___ 2. Discussion is underway aimed at stating a policy
___ 3. A policy has been stated but not all parties have yet agreed to it.
___ 4. A policy has been stated and agreed to by all relevant groups.
___ 5. A policy has been stated, but it needs to be revised, improved, etc.
___ 6. A policy statement exists and has been implemented.
___ 7. A policy has been stated and implemented and plans have been made to evaluate its effectiveness.
___ 8. In our jurisdiction there is an unstated policy which we follow.
___ 9. Other (Please describe) _____

4. Which school district/division/county do you represent?

_____

5. Listed below are a number of statements which describe the role and function many people feel reflect major areas of responsibility for the principal. On the grid provided please rank, in order of importance, how you feel these apply at each school level. Thus, if you feel that for an elementary principal the most important role is related to the Pupil Personnel function, you would place a (2) in the first box in the "Elementary" column. Please complete all three columns.

Role and Function Categories

(1) Staff Personnel: e.g., selection and recruitment of personnel, evaluate teacher performance, schedule teaching assignments, promote faculty growth, etc.

(2) Pupil Personnel: e.g., handle discipline, provide for pupil guidance, provide for pupil orientation, etc.

(3) Community-School Leadership: e.g., confer with parents, cooperate with community agencies, handle community complaints, etc.

(4) Instruction and Curriculum Development: e.g., assist in the formulation of Curriculum objectives, content and organization of instruction, provide resources, provide for In-Service education, etc.

(5) Finance and Business Management: e.g., prepare school budget, supervise accounting, administer purchases, etc.

(6) School Plant Operation: e.g., supervise custodial staff, supervise operation of plant, plan for growth needs, etc.

RATING GRID

Elementary	Junior High	Senior High
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]
[ ]	[ ]	[ ]

6. With respect to defining the role and function of the principal, my major problem at this point is: (Check all relevant items)

___ 1. establishing in my own mind what the principal's role should be.
___ 2. selecting a procedure for deriving consensus from various groups as to what the role of the principal should be.
___ 3. devising a strategy for implementing policy in the system.
___ 4. devising a strategy for evaluating the effects of implementing a policy.
___ 5. The situation is clear to me and I have no special problem at the moment.
___ 6. Other _____

_____

7. With respect to implementing change in the role and function of the principal in my jurisdiction, the major problem as I see it is that: (Check one item only.)

___ 1. the role of the principal has not been adequately defined.
___ 2. the role of the principal has not been agreed to by various stakeholder groups.
___ 3. there has been inadequate discussion regarding the role of the principal.
___ 4. implementation of the role policy has not taken place.
___ 5. I have no problem with respect to implementing change.
___ 6. Other _____

_____

8. How optimistic are you that policy with respect to the role of the principal will be implemented in your jurisdiction?

___ 1. very optimistic
___ 2. optimistic
___ 3. somewhat optimistic
___ 4. not very optimistic
___ 5. not applicable in my jurisdiction

9. When I think about defining and implementing policy which relates to the role of the principal in my jurisdiction, my major concern(s) is/are ...

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

WU/dfd
83-01-25

ATTACHMENT B

Workshop I: Post-Questionnaire

2. Code:_____

ASTA Workshop Evaluation Questionnaire

The Role of the Principal

1. Which one of the following best describes your role at this workshop?

___ Teacher
___ Asst./Vice Principal
___ School Superintendent
___ Assistant Superintendent
___ School trustee
✓ Principal
___ Other (Please specify)
_____

2. With respect to defining the role and function of the principal, my major problem at this point is: (Check all relevant items)

___ 1. establishing in my own mind what the principal's role should be.
✓ 2. selecting a procedure for deriving consensus from various groups as to what the role of the principal should be.
___ 3. devising a strategy for implementing policy in the system.
___ 4. devising a strategy for evaluating the effects of implementing a policy.
___ 5. The situation is clear to me and I have no special problem at the moment.
___ 6. Other _____

3. With respect to implementing change in the role and function of the principal in my jurisdiction, the major problem as I see it is that: (Check one item only.)

___ 1. the role of the principal has not been adequately defined.
✓ 2. the role of the principal has not been agreed to by various stakeholder groups.
___ 3. there has been inadequate discussion regarding the role of the principal.
___ 4. implementation of the role policy has not taken place.
___ 5. I have no problem with respect to implementing change
___ 6. Other _____

4. We would like your opinion on a number of issues related to the role and function of the principal. For each item below, please indicate your opinion by circling one response category:

Strongly Agree	=	SA
Agree	=	A
Disagree	=	D
Strongly Disagree	=	SD
No Opinion	=	NO

(a) The description of the role and function of principals in my jurisdiction is clear to all parties involved.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(b) The effectiveness of principals vis a vis their role and function is being adequately assessed in my jurisdiction.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(c) There is a genuine need at this point in time to re-evaluate policy regarding the role and function of the principal in my jurisdiction.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(d) The procedures required for implementing policy regarding the role and function of the principal are clear to me.	SA	A	S	SD	NO
(e) The procedures for re-defining policy regarding the role and function of the principal are clear to me.	SA	A	S	SD	NO

5. Workshop organizers would like your evaluation of various aspects of the workshop. For each item below, please indicate your opinion by circling one response category:

Strongly Agree	=	SA
Agree	=	A
Disagree	=	D
Strongly Disagree	=	SD
No Opinion	=	NO

(a)	The Workshop objectives were clear.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(b)	The Workshop covered topics/problems I expected it would.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(c)	It is clear to me what needs to be done next.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(d)	The Workshop offered useful methods for problem solving.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(e)	The Workshop helped me to solve specific problems I had when I came.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(f)	The Workshop provided me with the information I need to proceed with work on this problem.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(g)	There was adequate time for interaction with others.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(h)	The Workshop helped me to see how policy could be derived and established.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(i)	I would recommend this Workshop to my colleagues.	SA	A	D	SD	NO

Comments: _____

6. My overall rating of the Workshop was that it was:

___ 1. very useful
✓ 2. useful
___ 3. somewhat useful
___ 4. not very useful

Comments: As the sole participant from my jurisdiction I didn't enjoy the degree of participation desirable.

7. How could the Workshop be improved?

8. Did the workshop result in any benefits which you had not anticipated?

9. How optimistic are you that policy with respect to the role of the principal will be implemented in your jurisdiction?

___ 1. very optimistic
2 2. optimistic
___ 3. somewhat optimistic
___ 4. not very optimistic
___ 5. does not apply in my jurisdiction

10. What additional information/help do you need at this time in order to proceed with planning and implementation?

11. Do you plan to attend the follow-up workshop?

[✓] Yes [ ] No [ ] Don't know

Comment:

12. With respect to definition, implementation and assessment of the role and function of the principal in your jurisdiction, what actions do you think need to be taken now? What changes in procedure, etc., would you like to see in your jurisdiction?

1. Formulation of policy statement consistent with Role Defn Statement.
2. Review of Role Defn.

13. What barriers (problems) do you see in achieving the following?

a) defining/stating the role and function of the principal, if this has not already been done.

N/A

b) implementing stated policy re. role and function, if this has not already been done.

Conflict w/ other policy formulation in progress.

c) assessing the effectiveness of implementation.

14. When I think about defining and implementing policy which relates to the role of the principal in my jurisdiction, my major concern(s) is/are ...

15. Please complete the item below:

ACTIVITY	RATING (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE) 1 Didn't Help	2	3	4	5 Useful	✓ Check Appropriate Space O.K.	MORE TIME	LESS TIME
Introduction 1:30 - 2:00 p.m.	1	2	3	(4)	5	✓		
What We Expect 2:00 - 4:15 p.m.	1	2	(3)	4	5		✓	
What Others Expect 4:15 - 5:15 p.m.	1	2	3	(4)	5	✓		
Role Description and Analysis 7:00 - 9:00 p.m.	1	2	3	(4)	5	✓		
Action Plan 9:00 - 11:00 p.m.	1	2	3	(4)	5		✓	

16. In your judgement did this workshop help your district move toward developing a role statement and/or policy statement re: the role of the school principal

1 Didn't Help	2	3	4	5 Useful

Comments: _____

WU/dfd
83-01-26

ATTACHMENT C

Workshop II: Post-Questionnaire

2. Code:_____

ASTA Workshop II Evaluation Questionnaire

The Role of the Principal

1. Which one of the following best describes your role at this workshop?

___ Teacher
___ Asst./Vice Principal
___ School Superintendent
___ Assistant Superintendent
___ School trustee
___ Principal
___ Other (Please specify)
_____

2. With respect to defining school board policy governing the role of the principal my major problem now is: (check the one item that best describes the current situation)

___ 1. policy has been adopted and I have no special problem at this time.
___ 2. policy statements have been written but not agreed to by all stakeholder groups.
___ 3. formulation of policy statements is underway.
___ 4. establishing in my own mind what the policy should be.
___ 5. Other _____
_____

3. With respect to defining the role of the principal my major problem now is: (check the one item that best describes the current situation)

___ 1. role statements have been adopted and I have no special problem at this time.
___ 2. role statements have been written but not agreed to by all stakeholder groups.
___ 3. formulation of role statements is underway.
___ 4. establishing in my own mind what the role statements should be.
___ 5. Other _____
_____

.....2

4. With respect to defining the principal's job description (for example to facilitate monitoring activities) my major problem now is: (check the one item that best describes the current situation)

___ 1. a job description has been adopted and I have no special problem at this time.
___ 2. a job description has been written but not agreed to by all stakeholder groups.
___ 3. formulation of a job description is underway.
___ 4. establishing in my own mind what the job description should be.
___ 5. Other _____

_____

5. With respect to implementing change in the role of the principal in my jurisdiction, the major problem as I see it is that: (Check one item only.)

___ 1. the role of the principal has not been adequately defined.
___ 2. there has been inadequate discussion among stakeholder groups regarding the role of the principal.
___ 3. the role has been defined and agreed to but has not been implemented.
___ 4. the role has been defined and agreed to but resources for implementation have not been made available.
___ 5. I have no problem with respect to implementing change
___ 6. Other _____

_____

6. We would like your opinion on a number of issues related to the role and function of the principal. For each item below, please indicate your opinion by circling one response category:

Strongly Agree	=	SA
Agree	=	A
Disagree	=	D
Strongly Disagree	=	SD
No Opinion	=	NO

(a) The description of the role of principals in my jurisdiction is clear to all parties involved.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(b) The effectiveness of principals vis a vis their role is being adequately assessed in my jurisdiction.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(c) The procedures required for implementing policy regarding the role of the principal are clear to me.	SA	A	S	SD	NO
(d) The purposes for monitoring the functions of the principal have been clearly defined in my jurisdiction.	SA	A	S	SD	NO
(e) My jurisdiction has done adequate planning to ensure that resources will be available to make implementation of policy with respect to the role of the principal feasible.	SA	A	S	SD	NO
(f) My jurisdiction's plan for re-organization is sufficiently comprehensive to make success possible.	SA	A	S	SD	NO
(g) Adequate plans have been made in my jurisdiction to ensure that time and resources will be made available to principals in order to fulfill their role.	SA	A	S	SD	NO
(h) My jurisdiction's policy assigns sufficient authority to principals in order to hold them responsible for results.	SA	A	S	SD	NO

.....4

7. Workshop organizers would like your evaluation of various aspects of the workshop. For each item below, please indicate your opinion by circling one response category:

Strongly Agree	=	SA
Agree	=	A
Disagree	=	D
Strongly Disagree	=	SD
No Opinion	=	NO

(a)	The Workshop objectives were clear.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(b)	The Workshop covered topics/problems I expected it would.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(c)	The Workshop clarified for me what needs to be done next in my jurisdiction.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(d)	The Workshop helped me to solve specific problems I had when I came.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(e)	The Workshop provided me with the information I need to proceed with work on this problem.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(f)	There was adequate time for interaction with others.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(g)	The Workshop clarified the distinction between policy statements, role statements and job descriptions.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(h)	Planning a monitoring (evaluation) system was adequately discussed.	SA	A	D	SD	NO
(i)	The Workshop clearly indicated what might be expected in terms of sources of resistance to change.	SA	A	D	SD	NO

Comments re how Workshop could have been improved:

_____

_____

_____

8. Did the workshop result in any benefits which you had not anticipated?

_____

_____

_____

_____

.....5

9. How optimistic are you that policy with respect to the role of the principal will be implemented in your jurisdiction?

___ 1. very optimistic
___ 2. optimistic
___ 3. somewhat optimistic
___ 4. not very optimistic
___ 5. does not apply in my jurisdiction

10. With respect to definition, implementation and assessment of the role and function of the principal in your jurisdiction, what actions do you think need to be taken now? What changes in procedure, etc., would you like to see in your jurisdiction?

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

11. What barriers (problems) do you see in achieving the following?

a) implementing policy statements, role statements, and job descriptions, if this has not already been done.

_____
_____
_____
_____

b) monitoring (assessing) the effectiveness of implementation.

_____
_____
_____
_____

.....6

12. Please complete the item below:

ACTIVITY	RATING (PLEASE CIRCLE ONE) 1 Didn't Help	2	3	4	5 Useful	Check Appropriate Space ✓ O.K.	MORE TIME	LESS TIME
Defining the Role of the Principal 9:30 - 10:05 a.m.	1	2	3	4	5			
Description and evaluation of Role Statement 10:45 - 12:00 a.m.	1	2	3	4	5			
Role and Policy 1:30 - 1:50 p.m.	1	2	3	4	5			
Problems of Implementation 1:50 - 2:15 p.m.	1	2	3	4	5			
Dealing with Change 2:15 - 2:45 p.m.	1	2	3	4	5			
Monitoring Effectiveness and Other Problems 2:45 - 3:35 p.m.	1	2	3	4	5			

13. In your judgement did this workshop help your district move toward developing policy and role statements re: the role of the principal

1 Didn't Help	2	3	4	5 Useful

14. My overall rating of the Workshop was that it was:

___ 1. very useful
___ 2. useful
___ 3. somewhat useful
___ 4. not very useful

Comments: _____

_____

_____

1983-05-12
WRU:mz
UNRUH - asta evaluation

POOR

QUALITY

ORIGINAL